



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/678,807

10/03/2003

Mark D. MacLean

NOR-036 (16094RO)

3252

32836 7590 08/20/2009

GUERIN & RODRIGUEZ, LLP  
5 MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE  
MOUNT ROYAL OFFICE PARK  
MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752

EXAMINER

CHAN, SAI MING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2416

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/20/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/678,807	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MACLEAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SAI-MING CHAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2416	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/28/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating

obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2416

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claims 1, 10 & 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sandstrom (U.S. Patent Publication # 6697373)**, and in view of **Pangrac (U.S. Patent Publication #20010030785)**.

Consider **claims 1 and 10**, Sandstrom clearly discloses and shows a method of adaptively managing bandwidth (abstract) among a plurality of services contending for bandwidth on an optical link having a bandwidth capacity (col. 14, lines 53-61 (available capacity)), the method comprising:

- allocating bandwidth to each service (col. 14, lines bandwidth is dynamically allocated) contending for bandwidth (col. 14, lines 53-61 (available capacity)) of the optical link (abstract (SONET));

- allocating additional bandwidth (column 2, lines 59-65; column 9, lines 48-55 (if link is not at full capacity, bandwidth will be diverted from other segments to the one that needs it)) to one of the services in response to the current utilization metric of that service if bandwidth usage of the optical link is currently at less than full capacity, otherwise balancing the bandwidth allocation (column 2, lines 59-65; column 9, lines 48-55 (if the link is at full capacity, balance the bandwidth usage according to current utilization metric)) between the services in response to the current utilization metric of at least one of the services if the bandwidth usage of the optical link is currently at full capacity.

However, Sandstrom does not disclose computing metric of a usage of maximum allowed bandwidth, and the metric of current usage of the allowed bandwidth, so that the two metrics are made approximately equal to each other.

In the same field of endeavor, Pangrac clearly shows computing for each service a utilization metric (paragraph 0081, lines 10-20 (monitors the switch to determine the appropriate allocation)) representing a measure of current usage of a maximum allowed bandwidth for that service (paragraph 0081, lines 7-20 (monitor bandwidth usage so it operating within the maximum bandwidth capacity)).

- computing for each service a current utilization metric (paragraph 0068 (tracks bandwidth usage of each service type)) representing a measure of current usage of the allocated bandwidth by that service (paragraph 0068 (monitors and stores allocated bandwidth usage)); and

Art Unit: 2416

such that the utilization metrics of the services are made approximately equal to each other (paragraph 0069, lines 16-26 (demand for bandwidth may be moved to different RF modem for better bandwidth usage)).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Sandstrom et al., and assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Pangrac, in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

Consider **claim 15**, and **as applied to claim 10 above**, Sandstrom, as modified by Rose, clearly disclose and show a full utilization metric (column 11, lines 13-19 (cap (transmission capacity))) with each service to determine a maximum bandwidth allocation (column 8, lines 28-50 (target capacity)) for each service and a priority between the services to be used when balancing (column 9, lines 48-55).

**Claims 6, 8 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sandstrom (U.S. Patent Publication # 6697373)**, in view of **Pangrac (U.S. Patent Publication #20010030785)**, and in view of **Aimoto (U.S. Patent # 6144636)**.

Consider **claim 6**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Sanstrom clearly disclose and show the method as described.

However, Sanstrom does not specifically disclose that a bandwidth allocated can be a granularity of the STS-1 plan.

In the same field of endeavor, Almoto et al. clearly show the additional bandwidth allocated to one of the services is a granularity of an STS-1 path (fig. 4, column 3, lines 56-67, column 4, lines 1-3 (the gigabit Ethernet communication adapter can adapt to a lower speed)).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Bruckman et al., and assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Almoto et al., in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

Consider **claim 8**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Sanstrom clearly discloses and shows a full utilization metric (column 11, lines 13-19 (cap (transmission capacity)) with each service to determine a maximum bandwidth allocation (column 8, lines 28-50 (target capacity)) for each service when balancing (column 9, lines 48-55).

However, Sanstrom does not specifically show the priority associated with the service.

In the same field of endeavor, Almoto et al., clearly show a priority (column 1, lines 19-35) between the services to be used when balancing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught

by Bruckman et al., and assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Sandstrom, and assign priority for each service, as taught by Aimoto et al., in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

Consider **claim 13**, and **as applied to claim 10 above**, Sanstrom clearly discloses and shows a step of balancing includes removing bandwidth from one of the services and allocating the removed bandwidth to another one of the services (column 2, lines 59-65; column 9, lines 48-55).

**Claims 16-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bruckman et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 20040179519)**, in view of **Sandstrom (U.S. Patent # 6697373)**, and in view of **Pangrac (U.S. Patent Publication #20010030785)**.

Consider **claim 16**, Bruckman et al. clearly disclose and show a network, comprising:

a plurality of network elements (fig. 1 (32s (data nodes))) connected to each other by optical links (fig. 1;paragraph 52 (SONET));

a first path for carrying traffic associated with a first service through the network, the first path extending through the network over at least one of the optical links (fig. 1;paragraph 52 );

a second path for carrying traffic associated with a second service, the second path extending through the network over at least one of the optical links, the second path having a link in common with the first path (fig. 1; paragraph 52 );

wherein a first one of the network elements allocates a portion of the bandwidth (paragraph 5 (LCAS for bandwidth allocation)) of the common link to the first service and a second one of the network elements allocates a portion of the bandwidth (paragraph 5 (LCAS for bandwidth allocation)) of the common link to the second service.

However, Bruckman et al. do not specifically show bandwidth assignment corresponding to usage capacity.

In the same field of endeavor, Sandstrom clearly shows each of the first and second network elements determining for the first and second services, respectively, a current utilization metric (column 5, lines 63-67, column 6, lines 1-7) representing a current usage by that service of the bandwidth allocated to that service, the first and second network elements balancing the bandwidth allocated to the services (column 2, lines 59-65; column 9, lines 48-55 (if the link is at full capacity, balance the bandwidth usage according to current utilization metric)) if the current utilization metric of at least one of the services exceeds a specified threshold and usage of the bandwidth of the common link is currently at full capacity.

computing for each service a utilization metric representing a measure of current usage of a maximum allowed bandwidth for that service (paragraph 0006, lines 4-7



(computes the traffic flow)), such that the utilization metrics of the services are made approximately equal to each other (paragraph 0006, lines 8-15 (fair sharing)).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Bruckman et al., and assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Sandstrom, so that bandwidth is shared among services.

However, Bruckman, as modified by Sandstrom, do not disclose computing metric of a usage of maximum allowed bandwidth, and the metric of current usage of the allowed bandwidth, so that the two metrics are made approximately equal to each other.

In the same field of endeavor, Rose clearly shows computing computing for each service a utilization metric (paragraph 0081, lines 10-20 (monitors the switch to determine the appropriate allocation)) representing a measure of current usage of a maximum allowed bandwidth for that service (paragraph 0081, lines 7-20 (monitor bandwidth usage so it operating within the maximum bandwidth capacity)).

computing for each service a current utilization metric (paragraph 0068 (tracks bandwidth usage of each service type)) representing a measure of current usage of the allocated bandwidth by that service (paragraph 0068 (monitors and stores allocated bandwidth usage)); and

such that the utilization metrics of the services are made approximately equal to each other (paragraph 0069, lines 16-26 (demand for bandwidth may be moved to different RF modem for better bandwidth usage)).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Bruckman et al., and assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Sandstrom,, and assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Pangrac, in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

Consider **claim 17**, and **as applied to claim 16 above**, Bruckman et al. clearly disclose and show a network, further comprising a central controller (paragraph 8 (manager node)) for sending messages to the network elements (paragraph 8) that direct the balancing of the bandwidth allocated to the services.

Consider **claim 18**, and **as applied to claim 16 above**, Bruckman et al. clearly disclose and show a network, wherein the network is a ring network (paragraph 8 (ring network)).

**Claims 2 and 4** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sandstrom (U.S. Patent # 6697373)**, in view of **Pangrac (U.S. Patent Publication #20010030785)**, and further in view of **Branstad et al. (U.S. Patent # 6498782)**.

Consider **claim 2**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Sandstrom clearly discloses and shows the method as described.

However, Sandstrom does not specifically disclose a gigabit Ethernet service.

In the same field of endeavor, Branstad et al. clearly show a Gigabit Ethernet communication adapter (fig. 4, column 3, lines 52-56).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Sandstrom, and assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Branstad et al., in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

Consider **claim 4**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Sandstrom clearly disclose and show the method as described.

However, Sandstrom do not specifically disclose a rate setting mechanism.

In the same field of endeavor, Branstad et al. clearly show an adjustment limit parameter (fig. 4 (412), fig. 5;column 4, lines 46-57) with each service to control when to increase the bandwidth allocated to that service.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught

Art Unit: 2416

by Sandstrom, and assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Branstad et al., in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

**Claims 5 and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sandstrom (U.S. Patent # 6697373)**, in view of **Pangrac (U.S. Patent Publication #20010030785)**, and **Branstad et al. (U.S. Patent # 6498782)**, and in view of **Aimoto (U.S. Patent # 6144636)**.

Consider **claim 5**, and **as applied to claim 4 above**, Sandstrom clearly disclose and show the method as described.

However, Sandstrom do not specifically disclose a threshold value for current utilization metric.

In the same field of endeavor, Aimoto et al. clearly show that additional bandwidth is allocated to one of the services if the current utilization metric exceeds a threshold (column 6, lines 41-45 & 52-65) based on the adjustment limit parameter for that service.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Sandstrom, and adjust the bandwidth according to the threshold, as taught by

Almoto, in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

Consider **claim 9**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Sandstrom clearly disclose and show the method as described.

However, Sandstrom do not specifically show the service-of-interest.

In the same field of endeavor, Branstad et al. clearly show for each service, a services-of-interest list (fig. 2, column 4, lines 25-39 (the link is shared by other services, e.g. 1M , 10M, 100M and 1G speed Ethernet)) for identifying one or more services with which that service contends for the bandwidth of the optical link.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Sandstrom, and identify a list of services, as taught by Branstad et al., in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

**Claims 14** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sandstrom (U.S. Patent # 6697373)**, in view of **Pangrac (U.S. Patent Publication #20010030785)**, and **Aimoto (U.S. Patent # 6144636)**, and in view of **Branstad et al. (U.S. Patent # 6498782)**.

Consider **claim 14**, and **as applied to claim 10 above**, Sandstrom clearly disclose and show the method as described.

However, Sandstrom do not specifically disclose a threshold value for current utilization metric.

In the same field of endeavor, Aimoto et al. clearly show that additional bandwidth is allocated to one of the services if the current utilization metric exceeds a threshold (column 6, lines 41-45 & 52-65) based on the adjustment limit parameter for that service and usage of the bandwidth of the optical link is currently less than full capacity.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Bruckman et al., and assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Aimoto et al., in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

However, Sandstrom, as modified by Aimoto, do not specifically disclose a rate setting mechanism.

In the same field of endeavor, Branstad et al. clearly show an adjustment limit parameter (fig. 4 (412), fig. 5;column 4, lines 46-57) with each service.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Sandstrom, assign bandwidth according to usage capacity, as taught by Aimoto, and show an adjustment limit parameter with each service, as taught by Branstad et al., in order to balance the bandwidth usage.

**Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sandstrom (U.S. Patent # 6697373)**, and in view of **Pangrac (U.S. Patent Publication #20010030785)**, and in view of **Bruckman et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 20040179519)**.

Consider **claim 7**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Sandstrom clearly disclose the method as described.

However, Sandstrom does not disclose LCAS technology. In the same field of endeavor, Bruckman clearly show using Link Capacity Adjustment Schemes (LCAS) technology (paragraph 5) to allocate additional bandwidth to one of the services when usage of the optical link is at less than full capacity.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Sandstrom et al., and show the LCAS technology, as taught by Bruckman, in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

**Claim 19** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bruckman et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 20040179518)**, in view of **Sandstrom (U.S. Patent # 6697373)** and **Aimoto et al. (U.S. Patent # 6144636)**, and further in

view of **Montgomery, JR. (U.S. Patent Publication # 20040057453)**.

Consider **claim 19**, and **as applied to claim 16 above**, Bruckman et al., as modified by Sandstrom, clearly disclose and show the method as described.

However, Bruckman et al., as modified by Sandstrom, do not specifically disclose a linear network for the optical Sonet network.

In the same field of endeavor, Montgomery, JR. clearly show a network, wherein the network is a linear network (fig. 10, paragraph 57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Bruckman et al., and demonstrate that the optical ring network can also be a linear network, as taught by Montgomery, JR., in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

**Claim 20** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bruckman et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 20040179518)**, in view of **Sandstrom (U.S. Patent # 6697373)** and **Pangrac (U.S. Patent Publication #20010030785)**, and further in view of **Branstad et al. (U.S. Patent # 6498782)**.

Consider **claim 20**, and **as applied to claim 16 above**, Bruckman et al. clearly disclose and show the method as described.



However, Bruckman et al. do not specifically show the service-of-interest.

In the same field of endeavor, Branstad et al. clearly show first and second network elements each maintain a services-of-interest list (fig. 2, column 4, lines 25-39 (the link is shared by other services, e.g. 1M , 10M, 100M and 1G speed Ethernet)) for identifying one or more services with which that service contends for the bandwidth of the optical link.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a bandwidth managing method, as taught by Bruckman et al., and identify a list of services, as taught by Branstad et al., in order to guarantee that the SONET network is utilizing its bandwidth efficiently.

### ***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's amendment filed on 4/28/2009, with respect to claims 1 and 16 on pages 2-6 of the remarks, have been fully considered.

In the present application, Applicants basically argue, that Sandstrom does not teach or suggest “computing metric of a usage of maximum allowed bandwidth, and the metric of current usage of the allowed bandwidth, such that the utilization metrics of the services are made approximately equal to each other”. The Examiner has modified the response with a new reference which provides “computing metric of a usage of maximum allowed bandwidth, and the metric of current usage of the allowed bandwidth,

Art Unit: 2416

such that the utilization metrics of the services are made approximately equal to each other". See the above rejections of claims 1 and 16 for the relevant interpretation and citations found in Pangrac, disclosing the limitations.

***Conclusion***

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Sai-Ming Chan whose telephone number is (571) 270-1769. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/Sai-Ming Chan/

Examiner, Art Unit 2416

August 11, 2009

/Donald L Mills/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2416